

The Multi-attribute Elimination-By-Aspects (MEBA) Model

by

David A Pihlens

Submitted to the School of Marketing, Faculty of Business
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy, Marketing

at the

UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY

June 2008

© David A Pihlens, MMVIII. All rights reserved.

Permission is herewith granted to UTS to circulate and to have copied for
non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of
individuals and institutions.

Certificate of Authorship / Originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text. I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Author

David Pihlens

The Multi-attribute Elimination-By-Aspects (MEBA) Model

by

David A Pihlens

Submitted to the School of Marketing, Faculty of Business, on June 11, 2008,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Marketing

Abstract

Our research proposes a new, multi-attribute, parameterisation of Tversky's Elimination-By-Aspects (EBA) model. The EBA model conceptualises choice as a covert sequential elimination process with choice probabilities formulated over all consideration sets of the choice set. This specification attempts to capture the effect of context on choice behaviour. However, the EBA model has seen limited usage due to the large number of required parameters given the set of items under study. For a set of items T , it has $2^{|T|} - 3$ free parameters, which is infeasible for all but the simplest of contexts. To provide a practical operationalisation, we impose a set of *a priori* constraints on the parameter space. We define a generic multi-attribute structure to the set of aspects. This restricts the cardinality of the set of unknown scale values while retaining the functional (recursive) form of the model. The EBA hypothesis of a population of lexicographic decision-makers can therefore be tested in more market-realistic contexts, and inferences made over a large universal set of items described by the complete factorial. We call this model the Multi-attribute Elimination-By-Aspects (MEBA) model. The MEBA model reduces the set of unknown free parameters to a maximum of $|T| - 1$. We develop a general algebraic expression for the MEBA choice probabilities as a function of the attributes of the options in the choice set. This enables the derivation of a likelihood function, and consequently maximum likelihood estimation. We also consider the form of optimal MEBA paired comparison designs. Using Monte Carlo simulation and a discrete choice experiment with consumers, we conduct an initial empirical test of the model against the special case of the MNL model (that assumes no context effects) and find the MEBA model to be a better approximation of observed choice behaviour. This is achieved on a common set of parameters, and so it is due solely to the difference in functional form of the two models. We conclude with a discussion on future research directions, in particular the introduction of heterogeneity into the model, and the description of optimal choice experiments for larger choice set sizes.

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Jordan J Louviere

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Deborah J Street

Acknowledgments

I must first thank Jordan Louviere for taking me on as his student, and trying to educate me in stated choice methods. I am very lucky to have been exposed to his experience and behavioural perspective on the field. I must also thank him for introducing me to Deborah Street. I am extremely grateful to Debbie for all the guidance and mathematical teaching she has selflessly provided in our weekly meetings over the last four years. I also thank Leonie Burgess, for providing insightful comments at just the right moments during this PhD process.

I would like to acknowledge the commercial assistance that I was given during the fieldwork stage. Ben White of SurveyEngine kindly provided his software and generously gave of his time and advice in helping build the online survey described in chapter 4. Salvador Klein and Helen Brock of pureprofile were also very helpful during data collection, and quoted a favourable academic rate for the sample cost.

I have also benefited from many conversations with staff, colleagues and friends here in Sydney. There are, of course, too many people to mention in this section, but I thank you all for your insights and help over the last few years. I would, however, like to make special mention of Rob Chandler and Con Menictas, with whom I have shared many enjoyable discussions, and learnt from their suggestions.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance that I have received from UTS during this process. I thank the Faculty of Business for awarding me the staff doctoral completion scholarship last semester, and the Centre for the Study of Choice (CenSoC) and the School of Marketing for funding of the fieldwork.

Finally, I thank my girlfriend, Georgie, for sharing our relationship with a PhD thesis.

Contents

1	Introduction	24
1.1	Modelling the effect of context	26
1.1.1	Simple scalability	26
1.1.2	General scalability	27
1.2	Multi-attribute representation of choice items	29
1.3	The Elimination-By-Aspect (EBA) model	31
1.3.1	What is the problem?	33
1.4	What are the contributions of this thesis?	34
1.4.1	A multi-attribute parameterisation of the EBA model (MEBA) . . .	35
1.4.2	Theoretical description of optimal paired comparison designs for the MEBA model	36
1.4.3	Empirical tests of the MEBA model	37
1.5	Why are the results important for marketing?	37
1.6	Plan of the thesis	38

<i>CONTENTS</i>	6
2 Existing Theory and Literature	39
2.1 Choice by elimination	39
2.1.1 Markov chain representation of the elimination process	39
2.1.2 Choice probabilities	45
2.1.3 The proportionality constraint	46
2.1.4 The EBA model formulated over the consideration sets of T	48
2.1.5 The EBA model formulated over the aspects of the options	54
2.1.6 The EBA model for aspects is equivalent to the EBA model for consideration sets	57
2.1.7 The EBA model as a ranking model	59
2.1.8 The EBA model as an aggregate model	70
2.1.9 Review of applications and developments of the EBA model in the literature	72
2.2 Model estimation and optimal design theory	82
2.2.1 Estimation	82
2.2.2 Maximum likelihood estimation	87
2.2.3 Fisher information	88
2.2.4 Asymptotic properties of ML estimators	89
2.2.5 Optimal design theory	89
2.3 Optimal stated choice experiments for the MNL model	90
2.3.1 Optimal paired comparison designs	93

3	The MEBA Model	99
3.1	Notation	99
3.2	A multi-attribute parameterisation of the EBA model	101
3.2.1	Defining the set of all aspects	102
3.2.2	Algebraically referencing consideration sets of the choice set	107
3.2.3	Allocating the appropriate factorial effects to the consideration set ($b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }$)	116
3.2.4	Parameterising each effect	126
3.2.5	A general expression for the unique advantage U of a consideration set	136
3.2.6	The MEBA model formulated over the consideration sets of T	144
3.2.7	The MNL model in the current notation	146
3.2.8	Enabling the analyst to generalise the MNL model aspect-wise	146
3.2.9	The MEBA model and the EBA model are equivalent	149
3.3	Maximum likelihood estimation of the MEBA model	150
4	Paired Comparison Designs for the MEBA Model	155
4.1	The scale U when $m = 2$	156
4.1.1	Equivalence with the MNL choice model probabilities	158
4.2	The likelihood function	161
4.3	Maximum likelihood estimation	161
4.4	Asymptotic distribution of the maximum likelihood estimates of β	162
4.5	The matrix $I(\beta)$ under H_0	169

4.5.1	Re-expressing the squared cross-product given the class of competing designs	171
4.5.2	Re-expressing λ_{i_1, i_2} given the class of competing designs	177
4.5.3	The matrix $I(\beta)$ under H_0 and the class of competing designs	178
4.6	The main effects only model	181
4.6.1	The block matrix of $I(\beta)$ for the main effect of the q th attribute . .	182
4.6.2	The determinant of $I(\beta)$ for the main effects only model	183
4.6.3	Optimal designs for the main effects only model	183
4.6.4	Comparison with optimal main effects designs for the MNL model .	184
5	Empirical Testing of the MEBA Model	187
5.1	Simulation study	187
5.2	Observational study	191
5.2.1	Research hypotheses	191
5.2.2	Research approach	192
5.2.3	Context	192
5.2.4	Attributes and levels	194
5.2.5	Primary fieldwork wave	194
5.2.6	Secondary fieldwork wave	201
5.2.7	Analytical approach	201
5.2.8	Sampling frame and data collection	204
5.2.9	Results	205
5.3	Implications of results	216
5.3.1	Context effects	216
5.3.2	Measuring the sources of substitutability among options	217

<i>CONTENTS</i>	9
6 Conclusions	224
6.1 Limitations and future directions	227
6.1.1 Model specification	227
6.1.2 Optimal choice experiments for the MEBA model	233
6.1.3 Further empirical testing	233
A Orthogonal Polynomial Coefficients	235
B Simulation Results	241
C Supermarket Pasta Sauce Items	246
D Survey Details	251
D.1 Choice experiment	252
D.1.1 Choice experiment design	252
D.1.2 Example graphical choice sets	253
D.1.3 Example textual choice sets	255
D.2 Pseudo-RP choice task	257
D.2.1 Attribute coding of the items	257
D.2.2 Pseudo-RP choice sets	261
D.2.3 Example calibration sets	263
D.2.4 Example validation sets	265
E Survey Statistics	267
F Choice Experiment Parameter Estimates	271
G Pseudo-RP Choice Task Responses	278

List of Figures

1-1	A graphical summary of the relationship between the BTL, MNL, EBA and MEBA models.	36
2-1	The transition matrix for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	42
2-2	The transition matrix in canonical form for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	43
2-3	The fundamental matrix for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	44
2-4	The matrix of absorption probabilities for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	44
2-5	A Venn diagram representation of the unique advantage case for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	52
2-6	A decision tree representation of the EBA choice probabilities for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	55
2-7	A Venn diagram representation of the aspect case for $T = \{x, y, z\}$	57
3-1	An example aspect structure with $m = 3$ options	103
5-1	The average of the ratio of ρ_{MEBA}^2 to ρ_{MNL}^2 over all values of m and k	189
5-2	The average of the ratio of ρ_{MEBA}^2 to ρ_{MNL}^2 over all simulations for fixed values of m	190
5-3	The average of the ratio of ρ_{MEBA}^2 to ρ_{MNL}^2 over all simulations for fixed values of k	190
5-4	An overview of the research approach	193

5-5	A plot of the marginal utilities for the MEBA(1,5,6,13) model estimated on data set 3	214
5-6	Pseudo-RP choice task: Choice Set 1	217
5-7	Pseudo-RP choice task: Choice Set 11	218
5-8	Similarity indices for Leggo's item 1, choice set 11	219
5-9	Similarity indices for Leggo's item 2, choice set 11	220
5-10	Similarity indices for Leggo's item 3, choice set 11	220
5-11	Similarity indices for Leggo's item 4, choice set 11	221
5-12	Similarity indices for Leggo's item 5, choice set 11	221

List of Tables

3.1	Values for B_j , $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_{ B_j }}\}$ for $m = 4$ and $k = 3$ binary attributes.	101
3.2	Partitions of the choice set where $m = 4$ for different values of the q th entry in $d_{i_1, \dots, i_4, r, q}$	112
3.3	Referencing the 15 consideration sets for $m = 4$ with the q th entry in $d_{i_1, \dots, i_4, r, q}$	113
3.4	Possible allocation of effect $(\alpha\beta)_{ij}$ of option \mathbf{x}_1 given different values for $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), 1, 1}$ and $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), 1, 2}$	118
3.5	Possible allocation of effect $(\alpha\beta)_{ij}$ of option \mathbf{x}_1 given different values for $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), 2, 1}$ and $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), 2, 2}$	118
3.6	An example of the decision to allocate effect $(\alpha\beta)_{ij}$ to consideration set (c.s.) (1) using different values for the difference vector entries $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), r, 1}$ and $d_{(i_1, i_2, i_3), r, 2}$, $r = 1, 2$	118
3.7	An example of de Morgan's theorem for logical OR with two arguments . .	120
3.8	An example of de Morgan's theorem for logical OR with three arguments .	120
3.9	An example of mapping the ℓ_q levels of an attribute to $\mathbf{p}(\ell_q, j)$ using an orthogonal polynomial coding scheme	128
3.10	An example of mapping the $\ell_{q_1} \times \ell_{q_2}$ levels of the interaction of two attributes to $\mathbf{p}((\ell_{q_1}, \ell_{q_2}), (j_1, j_2))$ using an orthogonal polynomial coding scheme	129

3.11	Normalisation of the coding given in Table 3.9.	130
3.12	Normalisation of the coding given in Table 3.10 where $W'_{(3,4)}$ is given by $\text{diag}(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{10}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{10}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{30}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{30}})$	131
3.13	Values of $\mathbf{p}((2, 3, 4), (j_1, j_2, j_3))$ used for calculating $W_{(2,3,4)}$	133
3.14	Monte Carlo simulation results for the MEBA model.	152
3.15	Monte Carlo simulation results for the MNL model.	152
3.16	Parameter estimates for the MNL model obtained using the PHREG procedure in SAS 9.1.3.	153
3.17	Parameter estimates for the MNL model obtained using the estimation routine developed by the author in Mathematica 6.0.	154
4.1	Possible difference vectors for $k = 3$	171
4.2	A cycle for $\ell_{q_1} = 2$ and $\ell_{q_2} = 3$ and $m = 2$	172
4.3	Orthogonal polynomial coefficients for the interaction of two attributes with 2 and 3 levels	175
4.4	Decomposition of the contribution of a cycle by difference vector.	176
4.5	MEBA and MNL efficiencies for all possible choice experiments for $m = 2$, $k = 2$, $\ell_1 = 2$ and $\ell_2 = 3$	186
5.1	Attributes and levels used in the choice experiment	195
5.2	Displayed price levels used in the choice experiment	196
5.3	Displayed size levels used in the choice experiment	196
5.4	Observed number of facings in the supermarket by brand and type	199
5.5	Observed products in the supermarket by brand and type	200
5.6	The calibration / validation Pseudo-RP choice task set split	201

5.7	The six choice experiment data sets used in model estimation.	203
5.8	Primary fieldwork wave: Overall response frequency	206
5.9	Primary fieldwork wave: Average completion times	206
5.10	Primary fieldwork wave: Average completion times for 512 respondent sample	207
5.11	Secondary fieldwork wave: Overall response frequency	208
5.12	Secondary fieldwork wave: Average completion times	209
5.13	Pseudo-RP choice task: Completion rates by choice set block	210
5.14	Pseudo-RP choice task: Goodness-of-fit for the calibration stage	210
5.15	Pseudo-RP choice task: Breakdown of substitutability search using the Pseudo-RP calibration sets	211
5.16	Pseudo-RP choice task: Worst single main effect for source of possible sub- stitution	212
5.17	Pseudo-RP choice task: Goodness-of-fit for validation stage	212
5.18	Pseudo-RP choice task: Test of Hypothesis 1 on validation data	215
5.19	Pseudo-RP choice task: Test of Hypothesis 2 on validation data	215
A.1	Orthogonal polynomial coefficients for attributes with 2 to 16 levels	236
C.1	Pasta sauce options available in Bondi Beach IGA, 24th April 2007	247
D.1	Choice experiment design for main effects only	252
D.2	Coding of the Pseudo-RP choice items.	257
D.3	The $N = 64$ Pseudo-RP choice sets with the $m = 16$ item IDs listed for each choice set.	261

E.1	Primary fieldwork wave: Sample demographics	268
E.2	Primary fieldwork wave: Cooking and pasta sauce usage	269
E.3	Secondary fieldwork wave: Sample demographics	269
E.4	Secondary fieldwork wave: Cooking and pasta sauce usage	270

List of notation

\emptyset	Empty set.
2^A	Power set (set of all sets) of A .
$\binom{a}{b}$, read ‘ a choose b ’	Number of ways of choosing b objects from a set of a distinct objects, without repetitions.
\times	Cartesian product.
\otimes	Matrix direct product.
$\mathbf{0}_{m,n}$	$m \times n$ zero matrix.
$\text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$	Matrix with i th diagonal entry x_i , off-diagonal entries 0.
\wedge	Logical AND.
\neg	Logical NOT.
\vee	Logical OR.
$A, B, \dots \subseteq T$	Non-empty consideration sets of the choice set T .
A_i, B_j, \dots	Variables ranging over non-empty consideration sets of T .
$ A $	Cardinality (number of elements) of the set A .
$A \setminus B$	Set of items which belong to A but not to B .
A'	Set of aspects that belong to at least one option in A .
A°	Set of aspects that are common too all the options in A .
A^α	Subset of options of A that have aspect α .
\overline{A}_i	Set of aspects that are included in all the options in A_i , and not included in any of the options that do not belong to A_i .

$A_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)}$	The consideration set $A = \{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.
$a_{\mathbf{v}_j}$	$i_{\mathbf{v}_j}/N$.
$a_{\mathbf{d}}$	$i_{\mathbf{d}}/N$.
$(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$	Indices for the options of the choice set that comprise the consideration set B_j .
C_M	Information matrix $\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ for the MNL main effects only model.
$c_{\mathbf{v}_j}$	Number of choice sets containing the treatment combination $00 \dots 0$ with difference vector \mathbf{v}_j .
$\mathbf{d} = d_1 d_2 \dots d_k$	Binary k -tuple difference vector entry.
$\mathbf{d}_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)}$	Binary k -tuple difference vector entry for the choice set $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.
$d_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), r, q}$	Binary indicator for the difference vector entry $\mathbf{d}_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)}$ and choice set $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.
$E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots\} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$	Set of elimination steps.
$\mathbf{f}_j = (f_{j1}, f_{j2}, \dots, f_{j \mathbf{f}_j })$	Vector recording the attribute indices that comprise the factorial effect \mathbf{f}_j .
$(\mathbf{f}_j)_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{ \mathbf{f}_j }}$	Simple effect for the treatment combination $r_1 r_2 \dots r_{ \mathbf{f}_j }$.
$H(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	Hessian matrix.
$h_{i_1, i_2, \alpha}(w_{i_1, i_2, \alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$	Probability density function for subject α and choice set $(\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2})$ in a paired comparison experiment.
iff	Abbreviation for if and only if.
I_n	Identity matrix of order n .

$i_{\mathbf{v}_j}$	An indicator variable which takes the value one if all the choice sets with the difference vector \mathbf{v}_j appear in the choice experiment, and zero otherwise.
\mathbf{j}'_{ℓ_q}	$1 \times \ell_q$ vector of ones.
k	Number of attributes.
ℓ_q	Number of levels of the q th attribute, $(0, 1, \dots, \ell_q - 1)$.
L	Number of items in the universal set \mathcal{U} .
$L(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	Likelihood function.
m	Choice set size.
N	Number of choice sets in the experiment.
n_{i_1, i_2}	Indicator variable which takes the value one when $(\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2})$ is a choice set in the experiment, or zero otherwise.
$O_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{U} $	The i th item in the universal set.
$P(x, A)$	Probability of choosing item x from the consideration set A .
$P(x; y)$	Abbreviation for $P(x, \{x, y\})$.
$\mathbf{p}(\ell_q, x_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)_j, q})$	Vector of orthogonal polynomial coefficients for the value $x_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)_j, q}$ where the q th attribute has ℓ_q levels.
$\mathbf{p}^*(\ell_q, x_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)_j, q})$	Normalised vector of orthogonal polynomial coefficients for an attribute with ℓ_q levels.

$Q_A(B, \mathbf{s}, e_j)$	Probability that decision makers described by characteristics \mathbf{s} when starting with consideration set A will reach set B through the elimination of the options in $A \setminus B$ at step e_j . A transition probability.
$Q_A(B)$	A transition probability not conditioned on \mathbf{s} and e_j .
$R(1, A)$	Set of rankings of T in which option 1 is ranked above all other options of $A = \{1, \dots, A \} \subseteq T$.
r_A	Ranking of the set A .
r_B^A	Ranking of B , $A \subseteq B \subseteq T$, whose restriction to A is r_A .
$\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$	Vector of characteristics of a decision maker.
s	Number of subjects in the experiment.
S_q	The least upper bound for the sum of the differences for a particular attribute q in a choice set containing m options.
$T \subseteq \mathcal{U}$	Choice set of items defined exogenously to the choice process.
$u(\alpha)$	The scale (merit) of the aspect α . A real-valued, non-negative function.
$u(\mathbf{f}_j, (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), n)$	The scale value for the factorial effect \mathbf{f}_j .
$U(A)$	The unique advantage of the consideration set A . A real-valued, non-negative function.
$U((i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }))$	The unique advantage of the consideration set $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$ given the choice set $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.

U_{b_1}	Abbreviation for $U((i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }))$ when $m = 2$.
\mathbf{u}_j	Vector recording the $m - 1$ index positions of the difference vector entries in \mathbf{v} that refer to each of the j th options.
$\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{U}_x, \dots, \mathbf{U}_z)$	Random utility vector.
\mathbf{v}	Difference vector.
$\mathbf{v}_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)}$	Difference vector for the choice set $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.
$w_{i_1, i_2, \alpha}$	Indicator variable which takes the value 1 when \mathbf{x}_{i_1} is preferred to \mathbf{x}_{i_2} , $i_1 \neq i_2$, for subject α in a paired comparison experiment.
$w_{(\ell_{q_1}, \ell_{q_2}, \dots), r}$	Normalisation constant for the r th order polynomial for the interaction of attributes with $\ell_{q_1}, \ell_{q_2}, \dots$ levels.
$W_{(\ell_{q_1}, \ell_{q_2}, \dots)}$	Matrix of order $(\ell_{q_1} - 1)(\ell_{q_2} - 1) \dots$ of normalisation constants.
x, y, z, \dots	Choice items
$x' = \{\alpha, \beta, \dots\}$	Aspects of item x .
X'	The set of aspects for the universal set \mathcal{U} .
$\mathbf{x}_j = (x_{j1}, x_{j2}, \dots, x_{jk})$	Vector of k attribute levels describing the j th item in the choice set.
\mathbf{x}'	Aspects of item \mathbf{x} .
$x_{\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{d}}$	The number of times the difference \mathbf{d} appears in the difference vector \mathbf{v}_j .

$\mathbf{z}_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), b_1, \mathbf{f}_j}$	The orthogonal polynomial coefficients for the $x_{b_1 f_{j1}} \times x_{b_1 f_{j2}} \times \dots \times x_{b_1 f_{j f_j }}$ effect for option b_1 in the choice set $\{\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_m}\}$.
\mathcal{A}	$\{A_k A_k \cap A \neq A, \emptyset\}$.
\mathcal{B}	$\{B_j B_j \cap A \neq A, \emptyset \text{ \& } B_j \cap \{x\} \neq \emptyset\}$.
$\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$	Expectation value.
\mathcal{F}	Set of factorial effects of interest.
$\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	Information matrix for parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.
\mathcal{N}	Fundamental matrix.
\mathcal{P}	Matrix of absorption probabilities.
\mathcal{Q}	Transition matrix.
\mathcal{R}	Matrix of absorbing states.
\mathcal{S}	Universe of vectors of measured attributes of decision-makers.
\mathcal{T}	Matrix of transient states.
\mathcal{U}	Universal set of choice items.
$(\alpha)_i, (\beta)_j, (\alpha\beta)_{ij}$	Factorial effects.
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$	Vector of coefficients of a linear function.
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{f}_j}$	Vector of unknown coefficients associated with the j th factorial effect.
$\delta_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }), \mathbf{f}_j}$	$\prod_{t=1}^{m-1} \left(\kappa_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }), t} - \mu_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }), \mathbf{f}_j, t} \right)$.
$\delta_{\mathbf{f}_j}$	Abbreviation for $\delta_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }), \mathbf{f}_j}$ when $m = 2$.
γ_i	Systematic utility of item O_i .
$\kappa_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }), t}$	An indicator which records whether a similarity or difference is needed to create a partition of the choice set along the q th attribute which includes the consideration set $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$.

$\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\pi})$	Alternative notation for the information matrix $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$.
λ_{i_1, i_2}	$\frac{n_{i_1, i_2}}{N}$.
$\mu(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j }, \boldsymbol{f}_j, t)$	$1 - \left(\prod_{p=1}^{ \boldsymbol{f}_j } \left(1 - d_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m), (u_{b_1, t}), f_{jp})} \right) \right)$.
MEBA(j_1, j_2, \dots)	A MEBA model where the factorial effects $\boldsymbol{f}_{j_1}, \boldsymbol{f}_{j_2}, \dots$ have been defined as possible sources of substitutability.
$\nu(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$	An indicator for whether the consideration set $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{ B_j })$ contains a single option and not all factorial effects have been defined as possible sources of substitutability.
$\pi(x, A)$	Permutation of 2^T .
π_i	Merit of item O_i .
ρ_j	An indicator for whether the j th factorial effect is defined as a possible source of substitutability.
$\sigma_{(i_1, i_2)}$	Variance of the MEBA choice probability $P(\boldsymbol{x}_{i_1}; \boldsymbol{x}_{i_2})$.
$\boldsymbol{\theta}$	An arbitrary vector of parameters.

“The EBA functional form has considerable potential for econometric applications.... One drawback... is that the motivation for the model provides little guidance for parametric specification of the scale function....”

McFadden (1981) p.226

“Application of the model to market choice would require that [the scales] be made parametric functions of the measured attributes of the alternatives.”

McFadden (1980) p.S18

“The addition of such assumptions [on the structure or the relative weights of aspects] strengthens the predictions of the model and tightens its empirical interpretation.”

Tversky (1972a) p.297